

THE MADRAS LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Tuesday, the 28th May 1946.

The House met in the Council Chamber, Fort St. George, at eleven of the clock, Mr. President (THE HON. SRI R. B. RAMAKRISHNA RAJULUNGARU) in the Chair.

[Note.—An asterisk (*) at the commencement of a speech indicates revision by the Member.]

I.—MESSAGE FROM THE ASSEMBLY.

MR. PRESIDENT :—“ I have to announce to the House that the following Message, dated Fort St. George, the 27th May 1946, has been received by me from the Hon. the Speaker of the Madras Legislative Assembly :—

“ ‘ In accordance with Rule 94 of the Madras Assembly Rules, I transmit a copy of the Bill to amend the Madras Payment of Salaries and Removal of Disqualifications Act, 1937 (L.A. Bill No. 1 of 1946) as passed by the Assembly on the 27th May 1946 and signed by me, for the concurrence of the Council.’ ”

• II.—A BILL TO AMEND THE MADRAS PAYMENT OF SALARIES AND REMOVAL OF DISQUALIFICATIONS ACT, 1937 (L.A. BILL No. 1 OF 1946).

MR. PRESIDENT :—“ The Hon. the Premier will now move the motion standing in his name on the agenda.”

K. UPPI SAHIB BAHADUR :—“ Sir, I rise to a point of order. The rules require that there should be three days' notice given to the House. As we did not get the required notice before the Bill was put on the agenda, I suggest that the motion proposed for taking the Bill into consideration is not in order.”

MR. PRESIDENT :—“ I may submit for the information of hon. Members that under rules 104 and 112 of the Rules for the Madras Legislative Council, I have dispensed with the three days' notice and have set down this item for the business of the day.”

K. UPPI SAHIB BAHADUR :—“ Then may I request the Hon. the President to suspend also the rule requiring three days' notice for amendments and enable us to move amendments to the Bill? ”

MR. PRESIDENT :—“ I received some amendments yesterday and if any hon. Member desires to give notice of amendments now, I will have them admitted.”

THE HON. SRI T. PRAKASAM :—“ Mr. President and hon. Members, you are aware that the Salaries Act was passed in 1937 when the Congress Government assumed office in that year and that, when the Government resigned, section 93 of the Government of India Act came into operation, that Act ceased to be in force. That Act has been amended and passed by the Assembly. The

[Hon. Sri T. Prakasam] [28th May 1946]

Hon. the Speaker has forwarded the amended Bill for the concurrence of this House. I therefore move that—

'that Bill to amend the Madras Payment of Salaries and Removal of Disqualifications Act, 1937, as passed by the Legislative Assembly, be taken into consideration.'

K. T. M. AHMED IBRAHIM SAHIB BAHADUR :—“Mr. President, on behalf of the Mulim League Party, I rise to oppose this motion for taking this amending Bill into consideration.

“Sir, the House is aware that the original Act fixing the salaries of Ministers and other persons was passed in 1937 in pursuance of the general policy adopted by the Congress High Command. At that time it was said that the salaries were fixed after due consideration of the situations and conditions in this country and that no higher salary was necessary. In this very House, when the Bill came up for discussion, no less a person than the Rt. Hon'ble Srinivasa Sastri urged the adoption of Rs. 1,000 as the salary of Ministers. Then the Hon. Mr. C. Rajagopalachari said that there was no necessity at all for raising the salary proposed, that Rs. 500 was quite sufficient and that that Rs. 500 together with Rs. 250 in the shape of allowance was the nearest approach even to the salary recommended by the Rt. Hon'ble Sastri. Mr. Rajagopalachari also said that that meant no sacrifice. The Rt. Hon'ble Sastri said that it was a matter of sacrifice and that there was no necessity for sacrifice in the matter of salaries. Mr. Rajagopalachari then reiterated: ‘I see no sacrifice in what we have done. None of us drew high salaries, let me say at once publicly here. So far as we are concerned, there is no sacrifice. We claim to have made no sacrifice.’

“Then again he said with regard to standard of living, ‘So far as we know, in our country and among our people, if we judge the standard of living that we should adopt with the standard of the members of our class, our community, our position in life, our tradition, our culture, our status and all that, if we take that to be the standard of living, I say that the salary that we propose is much higher than the standard of living of the classes from which the Ministers have come or may come hereafter.’ That is what Mr. C. Rajagopalachari said. He not only spoke for the then Ministers, but also for the entire class from which the Ministers were then intended to be drawn according to the Congress standard. Further he said that the salaries fixed were scientifically consistent,—I emphasize the words ‘scientifically consistent’—with the very principles laid down by those who think that the salaries of Ministers should be fixed at a higher figure.

“Then, replying to the debate, Dr. T. S. S. Rajan, who was then the Leader of the House, concurred with Mr. C. Rajagopalachari and said, giving reasons: ‘We always feel that this should be done. For we are out for a drastic cut in the salaries of officers and establishment and in the expenditure on administrative machinery’. I ask, Sir, with what face shall we approach the people to whom we appeal for help, if we raise the scales of pay? Dr. Rajan stated further: ‘With the existing salaries we have to-day

28th May 1946] [K. T. M. Ahmed Ibrahim Sahib Bahadur]

set a new standard of salaries. Posterity will feel that the standard we have set up in this country will bring in an era of plain living and establish a right proportion between the life of our people and that of the administrators.' Now, I ask what is the reason for raising the salaries now? It is said that the class from which the Ministers are to be drawn, according to Congress standards, was not expected to be living a high standard of life. Dr. Rajan also said that they were setting up a new standard of living. Are they giving up the new standard of living now?

" Sir, I know that in the Statement of Objects and Reasons, it has been stated that, on account of the rise in prices, this rise in the salaries has been necessitated. The rise in prices undoubtedly does not necessitate the doubling of salaries. Further, there are 11-15 officers in Government service whose salaries are Rs. 500 and a.m. Rs. 1,000. Have these been doubled? They have been given some allowances—dearness allowance. And if the rise in prices is attributed as the cause for the doubling of your salaries, then I do not think it stands to reason. You may receive only a proportionate increase in your salaries. If not, let the Ministers say from their experience that the standard fixed in 1937 was wrong and that a time has come for a revision of these scales of salaries then fixed by the Congress High Command and enacted into law by the Legislature of the Province. Then I will have no objection. But to say that on account of the increase in the prices, these salaries should be doubled and that the allowances should be raised considerably, does not stand to reason and logic, especially in view of the fact that the salaries proposed for them were much higher than the standard of life of the class from which the Ministers have come or might come in the future according to what Mr. C. Rajagopalachari has said.

' Mr. President, Sir, I am not satisfied that the reason given for the doubling of salaries is quite consistent or right and from that point of view, I oppose this amending Bill. I want them to be consistent. They say they want to set up a new standard of living and, as the Rt. Hon'ble Sastri said, they want to be exemplars of sacrifice. Is this the way to do so? What is the standard of life of the people in this country and what is the salary that the Ministers propose to draw? What is the right proportion between the standard of living of the people and the standard of life of the Ministers? If they think that the salary originally fixed by the Congress High Command was not proper, that it was not commensurate with the standard of life that they have to live and that it was not a proper recompense for the work they have to do, then let them say so. Why should they take shelter under increase in prices? Why don't they say that the Congress was wrong in fixing Rs. 500 and that it is not possible for people of their status to live on that salary? You cannot at one moment say that you want to lead a life of sacrifice and at the next moment say that you want to lead a life of luxury and comfort. You cannot blow hot and cold at the same time. That is why we oppose this amending Bill."

[28th May 1946]

* SRI R. SURYANARAYANA RAO :—“ Mr. President, Sir, I had no intention of intervening in this debate at this early stage, but I am provoked to do so by the hon. Member who has just sat down. I too, Sir, have got with me the same text of Mr. Sastri's speech from which he has quoted. But I shall use it for a purpose different from that for which he used it. It is true, Sir, my revered leader the Rt. Hon'ble Sastri made some pertinent remarks on the occasion when in 1937, almost nine years ago, a similar Bill was introduced in this House. But in making his suggestions, Mr. Sastri paid a well-deserved tribute to the last Ministry for their desire to set an example of exemplary sacrifice and pleaded hard with the Leader of the House that a time might come when that example of sacrifice might not be possible to be continued for all time to come, as their successors may not be able to deny to themselves to the same extent as that Ministry had done. I feel, Sir, his words were prophetic. To-day we have before us a Bill in which the salary proposed is the one which he suggested nine years ago.

“ Sir, criticism has been levelled in this House, as elsewhere, that these enhanced salaries are not warranted to the extent there has been increase in the cost of living. If we see the index of the cost of living in the City of Madras, it is more than 200 per cent. After all the increase proposed in this Bill is only 100 per cent. I do not think, Sir, that the increase is too much. Moreover we want our Ministers to be free from want and at the same time to uphold the principle of austerity. Freedom from want as well as austerity are combined in fixing this salary at Rs. 1,000. They are not asking Rs. 4,000 or Rs. 5,000. They could have easily asked for that. But because they believe also in the principle of austerity, they have not done so. The word ‘austeriy’ is much in the air and they have always believed and still believe in it. Because the cost of living has risen abnormally high, to the extent it is necessary for them to keep up that very standard of life to which the Hon. C. Rajagopalachari referred, they have accepted the salary of Rs. 1,000. I do not think Sir, we should grudge to pay the Rs. 1,000 asked for by them.

“ Last time also, the Ministry would have fixed a different figure, if there had been no fiat from the higher quarters. This time, evidently, Sir, the High Command has been wiser and has not been imposing its view even in regard to matters such as these, for the cost of living differs in different places. What may be suitable in Bihar may not be suitable in Madras. I do not think, Sir, in fixing these salaries, our Ministry has given up either their ideal of self-denial or of self-sacrifice.

“ Then, Sir, I should like to refer to certain particular clauses in the Bill.”

MR. PRESIDENT :—“ May I suggest to the hon. Member that the principle of the Bill alone should be discussed now? If he wants to go into the Bill in detail, he may do so when the Bill is discussed clause by clause.”

28th May 1946]

* SRI R. SURYANARAYANA RAO :—“ I am only making certain remarks, Sir, on the general provisions of the Bill. I am not making any particular reference to any clause. I only wish to speak about the general principle of invidious distinction made between two offices, one the Speaker of the Assembly and the other the President of the Council. I am not going into the details of the salaries proposed. It is only the treatment accorded to the two that I wish to refer to.”

* MR. PRESIDENT :—“ You cannot do that without going into the details of the Bill.”

* SRI R. SURYANARAYANA RAO :—“ The same distinction has been sought to be made for the first time between the Chief Parliamentary Secretary and the other Parliamentary Secretaries to which also, I have some objection. Sir, if you will kindly permit me, I shall say a word or two on that aspect also.”

MR. PRESIDENT :—“ I am afraid you are again going into the details.”

THE HON. SRI T. PRAKASAM :—“ The observations of the hon. Member seem to be of a general nature. He is not, it seems, going into the merits or demerits of individual clauses of the Bill. I think that he may be allowed to go on.”

• MR. PRESIDENT :—“ Please go on.”

* SRI R. SURYANARAYANA RAO :—“ I see that some of my friends who were Parliamentary Secretaries before, are occupying the Treasury Bench to-day. All of them know what a curious position they occupied as Parliamentary Secretaries. As far as I know, Sir, there is no provision in the statute for the appointment of Parliamentary Secretaries. During the debate in the Joint Parliamentary Committee, a suggestion was made that Parliamentary Secretaries might be appointed to assist the Ministers. Perhaps it might be due to this suggestion that they are appointed. But when it came to the question of actual assistance, I think the Parliamentary Secretaries were of no use. I shall not be exposing any secret when I say that Parliamentary Secretaries could not note on a file. Parliamentary Secretaries do not get files from the Secretariat. . They cannot write any note on any file except on a separate piece of paper for the information of the Minister concerned and that piece of paper has to be removed from the file before it is returned to the Secretariat. Some of the Parliamentary Secretaries were vegetating. Some of the Ministers were not anxious to know what they were doing and how they were spending their time. Some Parliamentary Secretaries were wise enough to busy themselves with other subjects and did what they could to assist poor people who had representations to make to the Government. I think, Sir, that unless there is a change in the policy and it is made clear that Parliamentary Secretaries will have some definite functions, there is no use in making these appointments. The other day I read in the newspapers, and I am sure all of you have read the same, one gentleman who was a Parliamentary

11-30
a.m.

[Sri R. Suryanarayana Rao] [28th May 1946]

Secretary himself, characterized the job as a sinecure job. (Laughter.) Unfortunately he held the sinecure job till the Congress Ministry resigned. But what he meant was that these Parliamentary Secretaries did no work, were merely drawing their salaries, going about with the Ministers and remaining in attendance on them. I wish, Sir, the Ministry would come to a certain agreement with the Secretariat or change the rules of the Secretariat so that these Parliamentary Secretaries can be of real assistance to them and then only make these appointments. Or else they will be merely a butt of ridicule. It is not fair to the hon. Members of either House to be talked about in the streets or in the Press in the manner we talked about these Parliamentary Secretaries in 1937-38. It is not consistent with the dignity and self-respect of the Members of this Legislature. I would like the Ministry to settle first what work the Parliamentary Secretaries should do, to what extent they could peruse the files. If necessary, they may be asked to take an oath of secrecy to their own bosses though not to the Governor, if files cannot be shown to them otherwise. Or, there are many files which are not secret at all, the orders on which even the peons in the Secretariat know much earlier than they are issued. I would like something to be done, so that my hon. Friends may not be criticized in the public for accepting the posts of Parliamentary Secretaries which they do, I know, in all sincerity, to be of some assistance to the Government in the management of its affairs.

“ Now that you have allowed me to say something about other things, may I again revert to the distinction sought to be made between the Chief Parliamentary Secretary and the other Parliamentary Secretaries? We have heard of the Chief Justice, the Chief Secretary and the Chief Minister. But working as we do in a democracy—at any rate the Ministry is a democratic one, there is no distinction between the Chief Minister and other Ministers—why create this new distinction between the Chief Parliamentary Secretary and other Parliamentary Secretaries? Why give room for unnecessary distinctions which we want to abolish as early as possible? This is a new feature which we find in this amending Bill which did not find a place in the Bill brought forward by Sri C. Rajagopalachariar. I do not want that there should be any kind of discontent. There should be team work even among Parliamentary Secretaries as there is team work between Ministers in carrying on the administration of the Province. I wish Sir, the Prime Minister will reconsider this point even though it is in the Bill, before actually giving effect to it, and see there is no distinction. I have no objection to one of the Secretaries being called the Chief Parliamentary Secretary without the Statute recognizing him as something superior by paying him a hundred rupees more.

“ As you have allowed me to talk about the President of the Council and the Speaker of the Assembly, I should like to say, Sir, that I feel that the august office you hold—without any offence to the

28th May 1946] [Sri R. Suryanarayana Rao]

hon. Speaker of the Assembly—is a higher office. If a joint session of the two Houses is held, it is you, Sir, who should preside and not the Speaker of the Assembly. That shows the higher status your office occupies. We would like, Sir, that you should at least be put on a par with the Speaker of the Assembly, so that your dignity and status also may be maintained. But there are people who say that salaries do not count in maintaining dignity and status. All that is bunkum, Sir. They do count. Let us recognize that you too have to maintain a certain status in this City of Madras and it behoves the Government to see that you are able to maintain it considering the sacrifice you have made in order to occupy this high office. I would like these distinctions are removed from the Bill as far as possible, both in regard to the Chief Parliamentary Secretary and the President of the Council. I again repeat, Sir, that this institution of Parliamentary Secretaries need not be brought into existence unless something definite is settled about the nature of the work they should do. Thank you very much, Sir, for the indulgence you have shown to me."

* ABDUL LATEEF FAROOKHI SAHIB BAHADUR :—" Mr. President, Sir, I rise to oppose the Bill that is presented by my hon. Friend the Premier to this House. With regard to the increase in the salaries of the Ministers, the hon. Speaker, hon. President, Deputy Speaker, Deputy President, Parliamentary Secretaries and Members of the Legislature, we have to view this question in the background of the acceptance of office by the Congress Party in 1937. We all know, Sir, that before the Act of 1935 came into operation, the Ministers were receiving salaries in thousands. They were receiving salaries equal to those of the Members of the Executive Council of the Governor and Parliamentary Secretaries were also receiving fat salaries. When the Congress Party came into power they felt—and perhaps it was their election manifesto—that under the conditions in which the Indians lived, the poor people not even having one full meal a day, it was wrong on their part to burden the tax-payer and receive more salaries. My hon. Friend the Premier was a party to that decision. Now, Sir, let it not be said that what the Congress Party had done under the able leadership of that great South Indian, Mr. C. Rajagopalachariar when he was the Premier to ameliorate the conditions of the masses, has now been undone by the Prakasam Ministry.' This Bill is flung as a surprise upon the people to increase the salaries of Ministers and others because it is in their power to increase their salaries. What would have been their fate if it had been in the hands of other people to consider the question of increasing their salaries, as it is in their hands to consider the question of increasing the salaries of other Government servants? They have not increased the salaries of Government servants. I may tell you, Sir, that people receiving Rs. 100 and more are getting only an increase of 17½ per cent. My hon. Friend who just sat down said that the cost of living has increased by 200 per cent and therefore it is no wonder the Ministers should

[Abdul Lateef Farookhi Sahib Bahadur] [28th May 1946]

get at least 100 per cent increase. I say, that is the very reason why the Ministers should not get more, because they will be taxing the poor more on account of the fact that they have decided to receive more salaries. The very fact that the cost of living has increased, the very fact that the tax-payer, the already overburdened tax-payer, is being burdened more and more everyday, establishes that it is the duty of the Ministers to see that what was decided for them in the way of salaries in 1937 should continue. The consolidated sum of Rs. 750, Rs. 500 as salary, Rs. 100 as house-rent allowance and Rs. 150 as conveyance allowance, is quite sufficient not only for the necessities of life but also for other amenities and perhaps even for some luxuries. I do not grudge the Premier or any other Minister, or any other gentleman sitting on the opposite side getting more money, some of them are my very good friends, but I would very much wish that their income is augmented by some other resources. (Laughter.) But I say, as public service is public service, they have no right to receive more than what was intended for them in 1937. 'Changed circumstances' are put forth as an argument for the increase. What are the changed circumstances and conditions? Are there not millions of other people living in this country? Are the 'changed circumstances' only for a few Ministers, a few Parliamentary Secretaries and without any disparagement to you, Sir, for the Speaker, the Deputy Speaker, the President and the Deputy President? Are these the only people who are affected by the 'changed circumstances'? 'Changed circumstances' affect not only the Members of this House and the other House, but the whole country. Perhaps much more than money, what is difficult is to get things. People having money find it difficult to get things. The question of 'changed circumstances' does not arise and even if it does arise, it does not warrant any increase in salaries, but on the other hand the retention of the salaries as they stood in 1937.

"The analogy of Ministers in other Provinces drawing more was quoted. In the other House when Begum Amiruddin was speaking, some hon. Members interrupted her by saying 'what about Bengal and Sind'. First of all, when considering a particular question in a particular province, we need not refer to conditions in other Provinces. (An hon. Member from the Government Benches: It is inconvenient.) Not inconvenient. I am going to answer that point in a way which is going to be inconvenient to the hon. Members of the opposite benches. You are the gentlemen, not the Muslim League, who said that your cost of living will be very small, your tastes, habits and mode of living will be very simple, that a handful of groundnuts and a tumbler of buttermilk would do for your food and that a loin cloth would be sufficient for your clothing. The Muslim League Ministers did not claim that. They did not say that they would be content with a few hundred rupees. Therefore the question of comparison with other Provinces does not arise. Let us look at the conditions in our Province. Our Province is a province which from all accounts is threatened by a severe

28th May 1946] [Abdul Lateef Farookhi Sahib Bahadur]

famine and hence I do not see any reason why the Ministers and other Members of the Legislature should draw increased salaries. Now, if they want to do so, I only make one submission and that submission is: let there be an all-round increase so far as the Government servants are concerned and that increase should be proportionate to the increase that is going to be made with regard to the salaries and allowances of the Ministers and other Members of this Legislature. That is one point. The other point is that legislation should be passed to the effect that employers should give at least 100 per cent increase in wages to their employees. Of course I do not pretend to speak on behalf of labourers. Some other members sitting opposite may say, 'we are labour leaders'. I feel it is but just that if we want more for us, we should agree that more should be given to others also. What we want for ourselves, we should give to others also. What we want others to give to us, we should be prepared to give to others. Unless that is done, there will be no justification for passing this Bill and then to go out to the world and say that we are popular representatives.

"Now, Sir, a reference was made—you will kindly excuse me, Sir,—to the High Command of the Congress. For my part. I will not be concerned with the High Command or Low Command or anybody outside this Legislature so long as I am here in this House. My hon. Friend who just spoke before me said that the High Command was wise in permitting the increase in salaries. The Hon. Mr. Prakasam is reported to have said in the other House that the Congress High Command knew the conditions all over India and after giving the whole matter their fullest consideration have decided that Congress Ministers might take a salary of Rs. 1,500 including all allowances. If that is wisdom and if they are going to follow that wisdom, the less said of the Congress High Command the better. In any case, it does not lie in the mouth of the Congress Party in Madras to quote the High Command in their support after having flouted their decisions, rejected their recommendations and after all their good advice has fallen on their deaf ears. To speak of the High Command now simply for the sake of increasing their salaries is, I think, morally wrong. (Laughter.) We the Muslim League Party here feel that it will not be right on our part to consent to the increase in salaries. I ask my hon. Friends opposite who claim to be the friends of the poor, who, although for the moment, may be immune from public criticism, will one day have to face the electorate and seek their franchise, and cannot for ever escape the day of reckoning, with what face they will ask for the renewed confidence of the people after having, for selfish interests, for increasing their own comforts and luxuries, passed this Salaries Bill, while at the same time denying to others not only luxuries and amenities but bare necessities of life? We have denied the rights of others. We have no business just at the very outset of our work—we have met here only for the last three days and not much important work have we done—to enact a measure which affects the purses and the lives of the poor people of this country. Faced with the threat of

[Abdul Lateef Farookhi Sahib Bahadur] [28th May 1946]

starvation and death, the people look to the Hon. Ministers to ameliorate their condition and to the hon. Members of the Legislature to espouse their cause. Instead of doing all we can for the betterment of the people, if at the very outset we try to look to our own convenience and comforts, I think the people will be justified if they come to the conclusion that this Ministry has failed in its duty hopelessly and that what it has done is morally unjust and materially criminal. With these words, Mr. President, I oppose the Bill."

SRI RAO BAHADUR D. KRISHNAMURTHI :—" Mr. President, I rise to support the official Bill now before the House. It is very easy and simple for me to criticise the Bill and make a perfervid appeal to the public and say that the country is starving, that a famine is threatening and that the Ministers also should starve themselves. The salary of Rs. 500 was fixed in 1937 with respect to the conditions which were prevailing then. But much water has flown under the bridges since then. The purchasing power of the rupee has fallen to a third. What could be bought for 5 annas 3 pies in those days can now be bought only for a rupee and more. I do not belong to the Ministerial Party nor am I here to support their policy and programme. I am only examining the proposals in a dispassionate manner. The salary that was fixed in 1937 was fixed on a standard of sacrifice. The Ministers were expected to maintain the dignity of their position and dedicate themselves to their work. It was then thought that Rs. 500 was enough for them to make both ends meet. But now the purchasing power of the rupee has fallen considerably. If the Ministers should not be forced to borrow or sell away their properties, they should be provided with a decent living wage to enable them to live in Madras and attend to their duties. Rupees 1,000 is not an excessive sum in any view of the matter. Heads of Departments are paid substantial salaries and the Ministers who are above them must be paid at least Rs. 1,000. It may be said that the salaries of the staff have not been raised considerably. No doubt they are paid some war allowance but that does not solve the problem. But because there is a problem which requires solution by the Congress Ministers, it is not reasonable to ask the Congress Ministers to take a starvation wage and not be able to discharge their duties comfortably and with dignity. If it is a question of a Sanyasin or mendicant or persons who have no other source of income or business, I can understand asking them to be content with a low salary. People can live even on Rs. 75 a month. People can live, as an hon. Member said, on groundnut and jaggery. But do you expect your Ministers to do their best to solve the grave problems of the country while they are starving? Is not a Minister to have a comfortable house? Is not a Minister to have his stomach full? Is he not to be in a position to buy the necessary clothes for himself and his near and dear? If his domestic environments are uncomfortable, how can you expect him to apply his mind to the solution of the several problems? A seer of milk which was selling at 4 annas formerly is now sold at 12 annas. The same is

28th May 1946]

[Sri D. Krishnamurthi]

the case with cloth including khaddar. It is not as if Mr. C. Rajagopalachariar introduced a very effective and economic measure, nor can it be said that the Hon. Mr. Prakasam is indulging in extravagance by increasing the salaries of Ministers. The question should be considered in an impartial manner. The Ministry should be given a chance and an opportunity to show that they can discharge their duties satisfactorily. My hon. Friend Mr. Suryanarayana Rao said that the Parliamentary Secretaries had no work. That is a stock complaint. The Parliamentary Secretaries themselves were sometimes saying that they were holding sinecure posts. It is for the Hon. Mr. Prakasam to examine the matter carefully and give them sufficient work, so that they might justify the salaries drawn by them. I do not deny that the country is poor, it is unfortunately so. If famine is threatening us, we have to find ways and means of averting it. On that account we cannot ask the executive to starve and do their best. I therefore earnestly recommend that the Ministry should be allowed a free scope and given sufficient opportunity to work out their programmes and solve the several problems facing the country. One of the problems is the increase in salaries of police constables, village officers and karnams who are now paid very poor wages. The Ministry must find the ways and means to increase their salaries. If, by the grace of God, good fortune or luck, prices come down and living becomes cheaper, it is open to us and also to the Ministry to come forward with proposals for a cut in the salary of Ministers. For the present I heartily support this Bill and appeal to all hon. Members not to be swayed by mere sentiment or sensation but consider the question on its own merits and vote for the Bill."

* MR. R. W. THEOBALD :—" Sir, I rise to support the Bill. 12
There is one dangerous point, that is the reason given for the noon.
increase. The way I look at the question is this: anybody either here or in Europe—wherever they are—running the Government have an exceedingly tough job to do and therefore they should have no financial embarrassments whatsoever. If, out of idealism or out of reasons probably valid at that time, the Ministers took salaries which were completely inadequate for the work they had to do, that is a matter of past history. To-day they ask for Rs. 1,000 a month; they may ask probably for Rs. 3,000 or Rs. 4,000 per month. We want the best from them; we want their brains, able to tackle all the great problems that are facing this province. This province, we have been told, is facing food famine; I am absolutely certain that that problem will be solved and that there will be no famine, but we must have the very best brains able to tackle the problem quickly.

"The Ministers ask for a small increase in their salaries; to try to bring in the question of the poor and the starving is, to my mind, ridiculous. If you add all the salaries of the Ministers and compare the amount with the total revenue of the province, it will not exceed a small percentage of the total. There is this to be

[Mr. R. W. Theobald]

[28th May 1946]

remembered. It is quite wrong, I feel, to associate the increase in the salaries which the Ministers ask for, with the increase to be paid to Government servants. Government servants did not say in 1937 'we are nice people; we are going to work for nothing'; they said 'we are doing men's jobs and we want men's pay'. While the Government Ministers ask for an increase to-day, Government servants are not entitled to have their pay increased, because they did not start—if I may say so—on ridiculously low salaries in the year 1937; they started on reasonable salaries. We ought to be careful not to bring in the question of increases to ordinary Government servants or anybody else; what we are now voting for is an increase to the Ministry and Members of the two Legislative bodies. The two cases are not at all comparable; they are absolutely different; I feel that I must press the point that there is no comparison at all; whether the High Command has ordered anything or not is to my mind nothing; the Ministers in our province to-day have decided to work for us on salaries which, I consider, are very reasonable indeed. They have put forward only twice the previous salary and I feel we should vote for the increase with alacrity."

* SRI M. D. T. KUMARASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—" Mr. President, Sir, I wish to make the following remarks, while supporting the motion. The Congress Ministry when they first assumed office, wanted to make the people understand that they were in favour of cutting short the extravagant expenses incurred by their predecessors in office in the matter of salary, etc. They accordingly arrived at a figure which was ridiculously low. It is admitted in the Statement of Objects and Reasons that owing to the great increase in the cost of living, the salaries and allowances fixed in 1937 have been inadequate and it is accordingly proposed to increase them to the minimum extent necessary.

"To maintain their prestige and dignity and to be free from want, it is necessary to raise the figure. In so doing, will it not be better for you to say that the salary is trebled or even increased four times without making mention of the word 'allowance.' After doubling the salary the allowance is 50 per cent of the salary. I feel it is an indirect way of further increasing the salary. I further understand that the word 'allowance' is used for car in order to evade income-tax. Does car allowance include major repairs to car, change of tyres, etc.? Who is to pay insurance charge in case the car is to be insured, since it is Government car.

"I appeal to the Ministry and request them to take very early steps to revise the salary of their low-paid staff, when the necessity to increase their salary, etc., is felt by the Ministers. I can tell you, Sir, the low-paid staff cannot get on for a long time. Famine in every direction will surround them, if you do not see eye to eye with them and increase their salaries."

* MR. K. O. ANTONY :—" Sir, I also rise to support the principle that has been embodied in the Bill, for the adoption of which the Hon. Premier has moved. I agree with those who have

28th May 1946] [Mr. K. O. Antony]

already spoken before me, that the basis on which this Bill should be considered is not the increase in the cost of living. I do not want to consider what the High Command or any other body else says. The present Ministry has felt that what was done in 1937 was done as an act of idealism. If the present Ministry has come down from those ethereal regions to the mundane sphere, we should congratulate them. They have become more realistic. I certainly feel that they deserve congratulations for that. A salary of Rs. 1,500 a month, I consider is a living wage for a Minister. We should give a living wage to every one. I am opposed to increasing the number of the rich and the wealthy men in our country and multiplying the have-nots in our country. All our efforts in this country should be directed to increase and multiply a strong and sturdy middle class. I do not think that, by giving the proposed salary to the Ministers, we are going to increase the number of the very rich in our country. I feel that, for the very hard job they have to do, they deserve the salary they ask for. I take it, therefore, that the justification for the increase is not principally the increased cost of living. There is something, I admit, in that argument but I think it is based on the sense of realism that has dawned on the Ministry.

“ My hon. Friend who spoke on behalf of the Muslim League made much of the relief that could be given to the poor by the Ministers receiving the old level of salary. What does this amount to? Symbolically I understand its meaning. But in actual practice, is there anything much in it? Personally I do not think there is any meaning in connecting the poverty of the masses in our country with the increase of salaries to the Ministry. Famine has been referred to. I do not believe there is any connexion whatsoever between famine and the present Bill. The present Bill is intended to ensure a decent standard of living to the Ministers and every man of goodwill should support it.

“ It is said that the passing of this Bill will have repercussion on the Government servants, and that, if this Bill is adopted here, Government servants should be given higher salaries. I have got every sympathy for the under-paid men in Government service, but there seems to be too much fuss being made of this aspect in certain parts of this House. What about the millions of other people who are not in Government service? Certain hon. Members do not seem to think of them. You cannot deny the fact that in our country Government service is to-day the most privileged service; there are people in other services who have not got many of the various privileges that are given to Government servants. I do not think that the salaries of the Ministers are being put at such a high level that it is likely to have any repercussion on Government servants, especially in the higher ranks. It is well-known that the highly-paid Government servants in our country are probably the best paid men in the service of any country. For these reasons I support the principle of the Bill. We have been taught ‘ Give unto Caesar what is Caesar’s.’ In giving a living wage to the Ministers, I believe we are only doing our duty.

[Mr. K. O. Antony]

[28th May 1946]

"I must associate myself, Sir, with the sentiments expressed by my friend, Mr. Suryanarayana Rao, in regard to the invidious distinction that has been sought to be made in the Bill between the conditions attached to your office and that of the Speaker of the Assembly. I would like to know from the hon. Premier whether the salaries are fixed on a piece-work wages basis as we call it in industrial language. I do not know whether it is on the basis of the amount of time spent by the Speaker in the discharge of his work, that he is paid higher salary and given better conditions. I do not know what considerations have entered into the matter; I should like to be enlightened on this. I must also support Mr. Suryanarayana Rao's remarks about Parliamentary Secretaries. If there is no job of work for them to do, let us not have them; if there is a job of work for them to do, let us have them and let us know what their duties are. With these words I support the motion."

12-15
p.m.

LT.-COL. K. R. K. AYYANGAR :—"Mr. President, Sir, I would like to support this amendment. At the outset, I may say it is easy to criticise any Bill that is brought forward by the Government; but there must be some justification for criticism. Some of the members said that in 1937 the Ministers took only Rs. 500. Yes; it was quite right then; it is also quite right now for the Ministers to claim Rs. 1,000 because the cost of living has gone up and we must see that the Ministers are given a living wage, a minimum wage; and we should all help them in every way instead of putting obstacles in their way. They have just come into power; let us not hinder them in their progress."

"With these few words, Sir, I have much pleasure in supporting the amendment brought forward by the Hon. the Chief Minister to-day."

MR. PRESIDENT :—"The Hon. Sri Prakasam."

ABDUL LATEEF FAROOKHI SAHIB BAHADUR :—"We want to move some amendments, Sir."

MR. PRESIDENT :—"Such amendments as are given to me before the Premier finishes his speech, I will take up."

* THE HON. SRI T. PRAKASAM :—"Mr. President, I thank all those hon. Members who have supported the Bill generally. I thank also all those members who have opposed the Bill for the reasons given by them; because it is refreshing to find that the opposition is led by hon. Members of the League Party. The only point which they urge is that in the past, that is ten years ago, when the Bill was originally passed into law, only half this amount, i.e., Rs. 500 was fixed, and they ask, why should it be raised now to double the amount. One principle has been uniformly observed in preparing this amendment at the present juncture and so far as the Madras Legislature is concerned, the increment proposed has been made to apply not merely to the Ministers or the Parliamentary Secretaries but to all the members of the Houses as well. You may all remember what amount is being paid to

28th May 1946] [Hon. Sri T. Prakasam]

each member of a Legislature in other countries; we have not attempted to adopt their standards either in the past or now. During the last ten years, what changes have come upon the country every one knows. Every one knows also how much it costs in Madras to live and stay here for doing duty for the people in the Legislature. Perhaps some of us here have known the trouble to which ordinary people have been put during the last four or five days on account of the hotel workers' strike; that has now added to the difficulties of the members of the Legislature too. Even when there was no strike, people can easily imagine the troubles that the legislators are put to, staying in the City, paying for their boarding and lodging. Ordinarily one will have to take into account all these troubles; but now, in every respect, the cost of living has risen everywhere, all over the country. That is one reason which prompted the Congress High Command to fix the amount of the Minister's salary at Rs. 1,500 and other allowances also. The Congress High Command has come in here for some petty criticism. The Congress High Command has never been generally careless in the conduct of its affairs. When it comes to the question of a living for every one in the country and when the Congress workers had been undergoing all kinds of troubles during the last 25 years—the hon. Mr. Farooki also was once inside the jail and he knew something of it”

ABDUL LATEEF FAROOKHI SAHIB BAHADUR :—“ Thank you very much for the information, Sir.”

THE HON. SRI T. PRAKASAM :—“ Yes; but he has not known recently what jail life is and what the cost of living is to-day. He should have been in the Amraoti jail with some of us—a little tiny jail where there was not sufficient space even fit for human habitation. We congressmen were in jail everywhere. You may attack the Congress for your own reasons several times; but one must acknowledge that it is the Congress that has been labouring hard, with all their men put into jails, in the service of the country to secure freedom. I do not say that others have not been making any effort. The country as a whole has been struggling for freedom and of course those who were in jail did service from their own point of view, while those who were outside the jail were also making their contribution towards that end. It is because of such co-ordination and co-operation, leaving aside small differences and a few sections or a few groups, that we have been able to make progress. It is not an easy matter in a country like ours for putting up a continuous struggle, not for one year or for two years, but for 25 long years, and we have now reached a particular stage. Even at this stage we have got still some impediments put before us. I may say it is a matter of great satisfaction for me and to all of us and those who think with me, that the Muslim League friends in Madras, leaving aside the other parts of the country, have come to think and begun to preach that we must accept a low sum as salary and live a simple and honest life. To that extent, the Muslim League friends have come to

[Hon. Sri T. Prakasam] [28th May 1946]

think with us. What have we done? In 1937 a certain scale was prescribed by my hon. friend Mr. C. Rajagopalachariar as Prime Minister. That was considered sufficient at that time and that was also the standard fixed at that time and under those circumstances. Now, after nearly ten years, although we know exactly what has happened to this country and to the world generally on account of the war, we have not begun to reap the after-effects of the war. The after-effects of the war will be reaped by us only after a few more years, as was done after the first War. That time has not yet come; and yet unfortunately for most of the provinces even before the closing of the war, the food and cloth famine have overtaken this country. This country particularly, a country where enough food can be grown, not merely for the forty crores of our people, but also for being given to other countries, is now compelled to look to Washington, Britain and other places for getting rice. What rice is being got here, how people are living, how people are complaining in every place where this imported rice which is not fit for human consumption is being distributed—hon. Members should be able to imagine exactly how the country and the people are living to-day, when they simply attack this Bill. It is only under such difficult conditions that this Government have come into office. It is the duty of this Government to see that the salary which the Ministers propose to take to-day, viz., Rs. 1,000 is taken by them not for the sake of mere luxury or enjoyment, but for the work which the Ministers would have to do. The work which the Ministers have to do now is different from what they did in the past; and the work which the Parliamentary Secretaries would have to do, when they come into existence, let me assure the House, would not be the same as that which the Parliamentary Secretaries in the past had been doing. I am confident that every one of the Parliamentary Secretaries would be doing work which will be to the satisfaction of every one of you and would show that the money which they would take when they come into office is not for a sinecure appointment. What work we have before us, all of you know to-day. For every one of us, there is so much work to do. Every one of us, not only the Ministers, not only the Parliamentary Secretaries, not alone the Members of this Council or the Members of the Assembly, but even those outside, all of us, with the full co-operation of the people must get over this famine in the first place—famine of food and cloth we must get over. After getting over it, we can think of other things. I heard one hon. Member say that we can easily get over the food trouble and the cloth trouble; I am also confident of it, because I am feeling certain that everybody to-day is realising the situation. After we started to state the position in the country and after the Government began to explain the position in the country for some time now, people have begun to think about it. Hereafter we must not merely think about it, but we must seriously tackle it. It is with that view that we have found out the difficulties; we came into office in the belief that whatever troubles may crop up, we must just see

28th May 1946]

[Hon. Sri T. Prakasam]

through them with the co-operation of every one. That is why the members' salaries were fixed at Rs. 75 in the past—which was a pittance according to me—and that amount was accepted by you. And having lived for over two and a half years with that amount and realised the actual position, they have found it necessary to fix the amount at Rs. 150 now. Members of the Legislature are not expected to get their tickets of admission to the Council or the Assembly, to attend the meetings here and make speeches and then go back to the country and live a comfortable life in their homes. Every member who has been returned by the electors is expected to do all that is necessary to show that the electors' requirements have been properly attended to, that their wants have been redressed by them. There have been members who spent their own money whenever they went out into the country for doing people's work. Therefore, we thought that the members' salaries must be doubled. When some members even wanted to raise it to Rs. 200, because of our policy of doubling the old amount and because we did not want to make it extravagant, we fixed it at Rs. 150 for the members.

“ One remark was made about the salary of the Chief Parliamentary Secretary; why should he have been given a Rs. 100 more? Just wait and see who that Chief Parliamentary Secretary would be when he comes into office and the work he would be doing, and whether he would deserve Rs. 100 more than the other Parliamentary Secretaries or not. You can judge then, and if you do not feel he is competent to do his duties, you can then remove the Rs. 100 from his salary.

“ Then, something was stated about the President's salary. That question could not be debated here; but I may say that if it is found necessary without any flattery to you, Sir, that the President's salary should be doubled in the future, this House will not hesitate, this Government will not hesitate, to take the necessary steps to carry out the decision. As it is, we have doubled it on the same principle as in the case of the other offices. Therefore, I submit that the main thing upon which it is based was the rise in prices. Prices of not only food articles have risen, but the prices of everything relating to the existence of men have risen to such an abnormal extent that the people could not make both ends meet. No doubt, they are living and they are bound to live. I know people are living on anything which they can get from plants or other such things. Let us only hope that Madras would not become another Bengal where people died in streets for want of more food. It is for that purpose that we are all struggling here just now. I do not think I should be labouring this matter very long as all aspects of the matter have been dealt with on both sides. But so far as the Opposition is concerned, they have still got a feeling in their minds that the Congress has violated its principles. I say that the Congress has not violated its principles in regard to this question of salaries. The Congress High Command has been doing everything according to conditions and circumstances and they know the conditions not only of Madras

12-30
 p.m.

[Hon. Sri T. Prakasam] [28th May 1946]

but also of every other Presidency and they would be the last persons to prescribe a salary of Rs. 1,000 together with allowances. What happened was the Congress gave that freedom. You may take it from me that as a matter of discipline, the Congress High Command has not laid down any rule. In the United Provinces they have fixed the salaries of Ministers at Rs. 1,000, in Bihar at Rs. 1,500 and in Orissa at Rs. 1,000."

KHAN BAHADUR V. HAMEED SULTAN MARICAIR SAHIB
BAHADUR:—"What about Bombay?"

* THE HON. SRI T. PRAKASAM:—"In Bombay also there is not much difference. They adopted Rs. 850 as salary plus house allowance. I would like the hon. Member to go to Bombay and see where the Ministers are living. There the Ministers are provided with houses both at Bombay and in Poona, whereas there is nothing provided here or in Ootacamund. The rent for a building is much more than Rs. 250. Therefore, you should not suppose that we have in any way fixed our salaries higher than others in other Provinces. Even here, if there should be such an accommodation provided for the Ministers at Government cost, we have no objection to forego the rent and an amendment was put in yesterday to that effect. So, I say, examined from any point of view, we have not in any way violated the principle which the Congress has enunciated. Howevermuch you may all say that people require more to live in comfort, we are all pledged to the view that we must be doing the best thing in the interests of the people without caring much for our own comforts.

"Sir, ten years ago, it was fixed at Rs. 500 and now it is fixed at Rs. 1,000 and for that the whole speech of Mr. C. Rajagopalachari was quoted pointing out that it was laid down not only for that time but also for future generations. In understanding that speech, we must also be reasonable and must be reasonable also in interpreting and expressing our views on that speech. Why was it fixed at Rs. 500 in 1937 and why is it fixed at Rs. 1,000 now. The reason for that is, the cost of living has increased; no other reason. Now, if only the conditions existing at present disappear, normal conditions are restored and people begin to live a normal life, this Ministry—if it were in office—would not be receiving Rs. 1,000 but their salary would be automatically reduced to suit the prevailing conditions. We do not believe in unnecessarily taxing the payer and taxing the people in any manner. So, bearing in mind that we should have a living wage,—it must be understood that a man should be paid adequately for the work he has to perform and for doing brain work he should get fresh air, light and good food—hon. Members will please say how much one has to spend to get all these things. You should not fix it on a moral principle and say you should live on the salary fixed at that time or this. That is not a reasonable position to take. Though I would like to congratulate the hon. Members for the spirit they have shown in criticising and opposing the Bill, yet I should point out that they missed the main point on this matter.

28th May 1946] [Hon. Sri T. Prakasam]

I am, however, thankful to the hon. Members for the services they have rendered."

The motion was put and carried, and the Bill was taken into consideration.

MR. PRESIDENT :—" Yesterday two amendments to the Bill were received, one by the hon. Mr. B. Narayanaswami Nayudu to this effect, namely :—

Add the following, numbering it as clause (3) to section 4 of Madras Act IX of 1937 :—

" There shall be paid to the Leader of the Opposition in the Assembly and in the Council a salary of Rs. 500 and Rs. 300, respectively per mensem."

and the other amendment by the hon. Mr. R. Suryanarayana Rao, viz.—

' In the proposed clause 4 of the Bill insert—

*" a salary of one thousand per mensem " in the place of
 " a salary of five hundred per mensem."*

In respect of the above two amendments, I have to inform the House that these two amendments seek to impose an additional burden on the finances of the province and so they offend against section 82 of the Government of India Act and they require the sanction of the Governor before they can be discussed in the House. I therefore rule them out of order."

Some other amendments have also been received.

Clause 2.

* ABDUL LATEEF FAROOKHI SAHIB BAHADUR :—" Sir, I move my first amendment, viz.—

*' In clause 2 of the Bill, in paragraph 2, omit the words
 " a house rent allowance of rupees two hundred and fifty".'*

" Sir, I do not propose to make any speech on this amendment because we have already had sufficient discussion on it, but I still feel that the sum of Rs. 1,000 which the Ministers propose to take as their salary is sufficient to provide for themselves a house also. People who are getting a salary of Rs. 1,000 a month do not claim another Rs. 250 for their house rent. In this connexion I would like to point out that what was fixed for the . . . "

* SRI K. VENKATASWAMI NAYUDU (*Deputy President*) :—" On a point of Order, Sir, the Premier must first move the clause and the hon. Member can move his amendment only after that. I therefore think that the hon. Member cannot move his amendment at this stage."

* ABDUL LATEEF FAROOKHI SAHIB BAHADUR :—" I thank the hon. the Deputy President for the correction."

SRI K. MADHAVA MENON :—" I think the procedure is for the Hon. President to put clause by clause."

MR. PRESIDENT :—" I was also of the same opinion. I thought it was my business to put the clauses to vote."

[28th May 1946]

* ABDUL LATEEF FAROOKHI SAHIB BAHADUR :—“ What I was saying was this, Sir. The Salaries of Ministers were fixed in Act IX of 1937, which it is now proposed to be amended and the Ministers now think it fit to receive Rs. 1,000. I feel that a consolidated amount of Rs. 750 is sufficient even under changed conditions. I felt that increase in the prices of commodities was envisaged even at that time by Mr. C. Rajagopalachari who was then the Premier and to whose advice, to whose suggestions and decisions the other Ministers including the Hon. the Premier now have consented. Therefore I feel I need not add anything further.”

MR. PRESIDENT :—“ I do not think what Mr. C. Rajagopalachari said in 1937 should bind this Ministry. He may advance his own argument if any.”

* ABDUL LATEEF FAROOKHI SAHIB BAHADUR :—“ I did not mean, Sir, that it should be binding on this Ministry. What I said was the possibility of a rise in prices in future was also envisaged when Rs. 750 was fixed for the ministers at that time and that date has now come. So, I consider that even under present circumstances that amount would have been sufficient, but the Ministers are now going to take even more. I think Rs. 1,000 as salary may be given, but no house rent allowance need be given to the Ministers. I therefore move my amendment.”

The amendment was duly seconded.

THE HON. SRI T. PRAKASAM :—“ Since the hon. Member himself has stated that the whole matter has been discussed already and since he has advanced no fresh arguments, there is nothing for me to reply to the amendment. I therefore oppose the amendment.”

The amendment was put and lost.

Clause 2 of the Bill was put and carried.

Clause 3.

* ABDUL LATEEF FAROOKHI SAHIB BAHADUR :—“ Mr. President, I move—

‘ In clause 3, insert “ a salary of rupees five hundred per mensem, a house rent allowance of rupees two hundred and fifty per mensem and a conveyance allowance of rupees two hundred and fifty per mensem ” instead of the following : “ a salary of rupees one thousand per mensem, a house rent allowance of rupees two hundred and fifty and a conveyance allowance of rupees two hundred and fifty per mensem ” .’

Sir, my object in proposing the amendment is that I want that the rights and privileges of this House ought to be safeguarded. I know that you are the guardian of the rights and privileges of this House. But as Members of this House, we feel that the President of this body should be getting more than is provided for him in the Bill and at the same time should be placed on a footing of equality with the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly. As you

28th May 1946] [Abdul Lateef Farookhi Sahib Bahadur]

are aware, Sir, we are wedded to a policy of not increasing the salaries and allowances of the Ministers, Speaker or other functionaries. We feel however that consistent with our policy, the Hon. President of this august and venerable House should be placed on a par with the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly. I do not want to draw distinctions between the other House and this one as to whether this House is the greater or more respectable than the other House. All I wish to say is that the President of this House should be placed on a footing of equality with the Speaker of the Lower House. I feel, Sir, that the President should not be made to feel or at any rate people outside should not say that the President of the Upper House is getting less than the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly. For this reason, I suggest the amendment for the acceptance of the Hon. the Premier and I believe that on account of the reasonableness of the amendment, he will accept it, if he is not adamant and is not inclined to feel that because his party is in a majority whatever he says ought to be accepted. If he yields to reason, I believe there is no difficulty in his accepting this amendment. It is another matter if he in his wisdom feels—I do not want to propose it—that the Ministers and the Speaker should be getting Rs. 1,000 monthly; all I want is that there should be equality as between the Speaker and the President of the two Houses so far as remuneration goes and it is with that object that I have proposed the amendment.”

* KHAN BAHADUR SYED TAJUDDIN SAHIB BAHADUR :—“ I second the amendment.”

* THE HON. SRI T. PRAKASAM :—“ Mr. President, there may be reason and very good reason for an hon. Member to propose the enhancement of the salary and allowances of an officer to the level to which the salary of some others had been fixed. But here, Sir, we see quite a reversal of the ordinary methods. I am asking my hon. Friend to consider whether if he is not able to get what he wanted, he should propose that another man's salary must be cut so that they would be on a par with each other. The hon. Member referred to the dignity of the House. I feel, Sir, that it is very bad logic and that the amendment has been written up in a hurry and supported without reason.”

The amendment was put and lost.

Clause 3 was put and carried.

Clause 4.

* SRI R. SURYANARAYANA RAO :—“ Mr. President, may I appeal to the Hon. the Premier, though my amendment has been ruled out of order, whether he would consider the views expressed from all sections of the House in favour of a salary of Rs. 500 per mensem and accept the figure himself on his own volition? ”

The Hon. the Premier expressing disapproval, the clause (clause 4) was put and carried.

[28th May 1946]

Clause 5.

ABDUL LATEEF FAROOKHI SAHIB BAHADUR :—" Mr. President, I move—

' that clause 5 be omitted '."

* K. UPPI SAHIB BAHADUR :—" Mr. President, I beg to second the amendment. As hon. Members are aware the section provides for the pay of Parliamentary Secretaries. The object of the mover in moving the amendment is that the Parliamentary Secretaries need not be paid. It is common knowledge that during the days of the last Congress Government, Parliamentary Secretaries had no work to do; they had no access to secret files and they used to carry some bundles of routine papers for disposal—a thing which the permanent services could well deal with. Things are no better in other Provinces. Recently we came across a case in the Punjab where a Parliamentary Secretary resigned for want of work and he considered it a waste of time and tax-payer's money for him to continue to draw his pay, without doing any work. I believe that that was the reason why Mr. Karanth resigned his Parliamentary Secretaryship during the last Congress Ministry. If circumstances have changed, I expect the Hon. the Premier to tell the House what the nature of the work of the Parliamentary Secretaries will be, both in the House and with reference to the Ministers."

* THE HON. SRI T. PRAKASAM :—" Mr. President, I fear I shall have to correct the facts stated by the Opposition. Even during the last Congress Ministry, it was not all Parliamentary Secretaries that were without much work. There were Parliamentary Secretaries who had been having good work and had been of very considerable help to the Ministers both within the House in conducting important measures and also outside the House. My friends seem to be anxious to know what kind of work the Parliamentary Secretaries would be performing. I assure hon. Members that Parliamentary Secretaries would not be persons without work and they will prove the contrary when the whole plan is unfolded to the House and when the execution of that work is undertaken."

1 p.m. * K. UPPI SAHIB BAHADUR :—" Were they answering questions in the Legislature? "

THE HON. SRI T. PRAKASAM :—" Yes, they were answering; everyone of them was answering interpellations; they were looking into the files, studying them; they knew what actual work was being done by Government. Therefore I am submitting to hon. Members of this House that when the Parliamentary Secretaries assume office, they will be functioning very well and relieving Ministers of their work to a great extent."

The amendment was put and lost.

Clause 5 was put to vote and carried.

MR. PRESIDENT :—" There are no more amendments. I will now put the remaining clauses to the vote of the House."

28th May 1946]

Clauses 6 to 10 were put and carried.

Clause 1 and the preamble were put and carried.

THE HON. SRI T. PRAKASAM :—" Mr. President, Sir, I move—

' that the Bill be passed into Law ' . "

K. UPPI SAHIB BAHADUR :—" Mr. President, we have passed a Bill to-day, which according to the Hon. Premier."

AN HON. MEMBER :—" Sir, at this end we are not able to hear anything."

MR. PRESIDENT :—" Aren't you able to hear what I am saying? "

AN HON. MEMBER :—" I am able to hear you, but not the hon. Member. May I request you to have the loud speaker arrangement installed in this House also."

* K. UPPI SAHIB BAHADUR :—" The Hon. Premier says the salary now passed is sufficient salary. But according to the Opposition it is a fat salary. The self-denying rule of the Ministry will affect others adversely. So we said that the services also should be paid sufficient salary. If a man does not get sufficient wages for the work turned out by him the output of his work will be half-hearted. That is why, we the Muslim League Party agitate for an increase of salary of the services in the interests of the people and in the interest of Government itself. They ought to get a salary which befits their status.

" Apart from this consideration, Sir, let me say the Hon. Premier has to-day treated this House in a very shabby manner. A Bill passed by the other House has been thrown on this House this morning without notice. At least we must be given time to read and study the Bill. He knows well that we are not members of the other House. He cannot expect us to attend the other House. It is for him to explain to this House the implications of the Bill, as he did to the other House. At least he should have given 24 hours' time to this House for the Members to study the Bill. Without studying the Bill, how can we move amendments? When he speaks in this House we cannot study the Bill. I hope, Sir, you, Mr. President, hereafter when important matters are brought before this House you will insist upon Government giving us sufficient notice to study them. With these words, Sir, I congratulate the Premier (Laughter) for piloting this Bill safely in this House and securing a fat salary." (Laughter).

The motion was put and carried and the Bill was passed into law.

MR. PRESIDENT :—" The House will now adjourn for lunch and meet again at 2-15 p.m. to-day."